1 2 3	Charles A. Lyman BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILEY PC 1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300 Seattle, Washington 98101-1618 Telephone: 206.292.8930 Facsimile: 206.386.5130	THE HONORABLE LONNY R. SUKO NOTED FOR CONSIDERATION ON: MONDAY, MAY 16, 2011 WITHOUT ARGUMENT
4	Attorneys for Defendant Citimortgage	
5		
6 7		
8		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
10		
11		
12	EDWARD J. CARCICH and JENNIE VEGA-CARCICH,	No.: 10-429-LRS
13	Plaintiffs,	MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITE
14	V.	STATEMENT
15	CITIMORTGAGE,	
16	Defendant.	
17	Dolondant.	
18	Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e), defendant CitiMortgage	
19	respectfully requests that the Court employ measures to assure plaintiff's compliance with	
20	the federal rules. Specifically, CitiMortgage requests that the Court direct plaintiff to comply	
21	with Fed. Rule Civ. P. 8(a)(2) and (e)(1).	
22	On or about December 9, 2010, plaintiffs Edward J. Carcich and Jennie Vega-Carcich	
23	filed a complaint against CitiMortgage alleging a multitude of violations of the Fair Debt	
24		
25		
26	•	

Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") along with violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA"). (Docket No. 1).¹

The complaint consists of 21 single-spaced pages, including 91 "counts" under the FDCPA, and is composed in large part, of immaterial, impertinent, and redundant information. Furthermore, Plaintiffs' complaint is replete with argumentative assertions, legal conclusions, and a confusing mix of both. For example, Plaintiffs "contest whether and how [the loan agreement] was validated, and charged unlawful actions in an attempt to collect for an undisclosed third party, and false credit reporting of the alleged debt, in violation of the civil rights of the Carciches" and the FDCPA and FCRA (Docket No. 1, p. 2). ²

Plaintiffs also create causes of action. For example, the complaint contains over 70 allegations that CitiMortgage violated some type of telephone call protocol by not "advis[ing] us of our civil rights and by not invoking the consumer warning 'this is an attempt to collect a debt and any information will be used for that purpose." (*Id.* at pp. 4-19). Plaintiffs also make numerous claims against CitiMortgage for "overshadowing" (*Id.* at pp. 19-20).

For the reasons set forth more fully in CitiMortgage's Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed contemporaneously with this Motion, the Court should require Plaintiffs to file an amended complaint that complies with the federal rules.

20

2

3

5

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Although Plaintiffs filed their complaint on December 9, 2010, they did not serve the complaint on CitiMortgage until January 18, 2011 (Docket No. 14), and only did so after the Court entered an order directing service (Docket No. 11).

² Because Plaintiffs did not number their allegations or use pleading paper, CitiMortgage is unable to cite to these allegations with more specificity.

DATED: April 12, 2011 BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILEY PC By /s/ Charles A. Lyman Charles A. Lyman, WSBA #30495 Attorneys for Defendant Citimortgage

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
2	I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on	
3	April 12, 2011, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court	
4	using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties of record.	
5	I further certify that the following parties received the foregoing document:	
6	Edward J. Carcich via first class mail, postage prepaid. Jennie Vega-Carcich via facsimile.	
7	7512 Big Meadows Road	
8	Chattaroy, WA 99003 pro se plaintiffs	
9		
10	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington at	
11	Seattle, Washington, that the foregoing is true and correct.	
12	DATED: April 12, 2011	
13		
14	By Suzanne M. Petersen	
15	13287366.1	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		